

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 2-21 and 23-42 are allowed.

Claims 43 and 44 are amended herein.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-21 and 23-44 are currently pending and under consideration.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 43 AND 44 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(B) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY UDD (USP# 5,455,698)

The present invention as recited in claim 43 (as amended herein) relates to an optical sender comprising "a shut-down device reducing a power of the optical signal outputted from said optical modulator when receiving a wavelength alarm relating to a wavelength of the light beam." That is, the light source keeps outputting the light beam and a wavelength of the light beam can be monitored after the shut-down device receives a wavelength alarm relating to a wavelength of the light beam. Accordingly, the claimed optical sender can immediately output the optical signal without reducing the power of the optical signal outputted from the modulator when the shut-down device does not receive a wavelength alarm relating to a wavelength of the light beam.

Udd teaches a secure communication alarm system. In Udd, an output from a harmonic analyzer 2527 is fed into an alarm system 2531, which monitors changes in the alarm system 2531. If a threshold of the alarm system is exceeded, a signal is sent to a light source controller 2533 that shuts down a light source 2507 (see column 20, lines 13-28).

However, Udd teaches shutting down the light source 2507 when the light source controller 2533 receives an alarm, but fails to teach keeping the light source 2507 outputting a light beam, and reducing a power of an optical signal outputted from a modulator when the light source controller 2533 receives the alarm. Therefore, the system of Udd cannot monitor the light beam of the light source (2507) after the light source (2507) is shut down, and further, cannot immediately output the light beam of the light source (2507) even if the light source (2507) becomes normal. It is submitted that Udd fails to teach or suggest the features recited in

claim 43 of the present invention.

Similar to claim 43, claim 44 recites, "reducing a power of the optical signal outputted by said modulating when receiving a wavelength alarm relating to a wavelength of the light beam, the wavelength alarm being provided inside an optical sender," which distinguishes over Udd.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 43 AND 44 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER MIYAZAKI (USP# 6,040,931) IN VIEW OF MIYACHI ET AL. (USP# 5,920,414)

Miyazaki teaches a shut-off unit 26 shutting off an optical signal in case the monitored parameter does not satisfy a predetermined condition (in column 4, lines 38-42), a shut-down circuit 130 controlling the supply of a driving current to laser diode 30 from a driving unit 32 in accordance with a signal output by a judgment unit 24 (in column 8, lines 64-67), and a shut-down circuit 130 controlling a driving unit 32 so that the driving unit 32 reduces a magnitude of a driving current supplied to the laser diode 30 (in column 9, lines 9-12).

However, Miyazaki teaches shutting down the light-source unit 20 or the laser diode 30 in accordance with a signal output by the judgment unit 24, but fails to teach keeping the light-source unit 20 or the laser diode 30 outputting a light beam, and reducing a power of an optical signal outputted from a modulator in accordance with a signal output by the judgment unit 24. The optical transmitter terminal station apparatus and optical communication system of Miyazaki cannot monitor the light beam of the light-source unit 20 or the laser diode 30 after the light-source 20 or the laser diode 30 are shut down. Therefore, the optical transmitter terminal station apparatus and the optical communication system of Miyazaki cannot immediately output the light beam of the light-source unit 20 or the laser diode 30 even if light beam becomes normal. Miyazaki fails to teach the features recited in claims 43 and 44 of the present invention.

Like Miyazaki, Miyachi also fails to teach a shut-down device reducing a power of the optical signal outputted from an optical modulator when receiving a wavelength alarm relating to a wavelength of the light beam. It is submitted that Miyazaki and Miyachi, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the features recited in claims 43 and 44.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

IV. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each

of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 2, 2005

By: Derrick L. Fields
Derrick L. Fields
Registration No. 50,133

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501